DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 050 647 48 FL 002 232

| | |
|---|---|
| AUTHOR | Hoge, Henry W., Comp. |
| TITLE | The Evolution of Brazilian Portuguese: A Survey. |
| INSTITUTION | Wisconsin Univ., Madison. |
| SPONS AGENCY | Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research. |
| BUREAU NO | BR-5-1258 |
| PUB DATE | 69 |
| CONTRACT | OEC-5-14-005 |
| NOTE | 89p.; Part 3 of "Studies in the Syntax of Brazilian Portuguese" |
| EDRS PRICE | EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29 |
| DESCRIPTORS | Diachronic Linguistics, Dialect Studies, Language Research, Latin American Culture, *Linguistics, *Literature, *Luso Brazilian Culture, Nonstandard Dialects, *Portuguese, Resource Materials, Romance Languages, *Syntax |
| IDENTIFIERS | *Brazil |

ABSTRACT

This third section of the research project, "The Syntax of Contemporary Brazilian Portuguese," presents a descriptive and historical survey of the evolution of the language. Included in the work are: (1) a summary of historical concern with this subject reflecting literary and linguistic interest, (2) classification and discussion of language levels, (3) a discussion of cultural and linguistic regions or dialect areas of Brazil, and (4) the presentation of various conclusions drawn from an analysis of certain "moot" points in Brazilian linguistics. An extensive section of notes is included. For the companion documents see FL 002 231 and FL 002 233. (RL)

Title VI, Sec 602, NDEA
PA-48 BUREAU # 5-1258

Part III

ED050647

# THE EVOLUTION OF BRAZILIAN PORTUGUESE: A SURVEY

by

Henry W. Hoge
Department of Modern Languages
The Florida State University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Tallahassee, Florida
1969

U.S. Office of Education

Contract No. OE-5-14-005

This work was developed pursuant to a contract between the United States Office of Education and the University of Wisconsin, and is published with permission of the United States Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

ED050647

# THE EVOLUTION OF BRAZILIAN PORTUGUESE: A SURVEY

Henry W. Hoge

> . . . e cõ tudo eu não dou licença que alguém possa ser meu juiz se não quem ler os livros que eu li: e com tanto trabalho e tambẽ ou milhor entẽdidas. E ainda assi a sentença ha de ser que para emendar meus erros escreuam da mesma materea outras obras milhores: nas quẽs mostrẽ saber mais queu disto de que falamos.
>
> (Fernão de Oliveira, Grammatica da lingoagem portugueza, p. 107-108.)

> Oo, com quanto cuidado e diligência vimos grandes volumes de livros, de desvairadas linguagens e terras; e isso meesmo púbricas escrituras de muitos cartórios e outros lugares nos quais depois de longas vegílias e grandes trabalhos mais certidom aver non podemos da conteuda em esta obra.
>
> (Fernão Lopes, Crónica, apud S. da Silva Neto, Ensaios, p. 195.)

Department of Modern Languages
The Florida State University
1969

# THE SYNTAX OF CONTEMPORARY BRAZILIAN PORTUGUESE

## PART III

## THE EVOLUTION OF BRAZILIAN PORTUGUESE: A SURVEY

In previous sections of this study, we have presented a *Selective Bibliography of Luso-Brazilian Linguistics* (*Part I*),[1] and a *Selective Bibliography of Contemporary Brazilian Authors* (*Part II*).[2] In the remaining sections, we propose to present a descriptive and historical survey of the evolution of Brazilian Portuguese, to include (*Part III*): a) a summary of historical concern with this subject, both literary and linguistic (or philological); b) a classification and discussion of language levels; c) a discussion of cultural and linguistic regions or dialect areas of Brazil; d) the presentation of such conclusions as seem reasonable on certain moot points in Brazilian linguistics; and (*Part IV*): e) a survey of the characteristics of Brazilian Portuguese on the several linguistic levels identified; and f) a survey of the contemporary usage of Brazil'an with relation to these characteristics.

It is convenient to establish certain time periods or linguistic phases in the historical evolution of Portuguese. It will be understood that we view the evolution of the language of Brazil as a continuous process, not to be arrested for observation at any moment, except by an artificial and conventional procedure. The divisions suggested will permit a more systematic presentation, but are not to be viewed as rigid; in the literary divisions, for example, which have been the object of intensive study and analysis, the final phase of a given dominant attitude is regularly seen to be permeated by the first movements and stirrings of a new and different orientation. In the broadest terms, we may propose the following historical phases: A. *The genesis and formation of Peninsular Portuguese* (XII to XV Centuries)[3]; B. *The Expansion of Portuguese* (XV - XVI Centuries); and C. *Differentiation and Conservation* (XVI - Present).

The final phase of Reconquest in Portugal was initiated in 1189 with the defeat of Alvor; the southward march continued until 1249, the date marking the integration of the territory of Portugal.[4] Despite the significant population shifts in the resettlement period, there remained a distinct North/South dialect opposition in the Portuguese area. More specifically, a North-East (Trás-os-Montes/Alto Douro) versus a South-West (Beira-Baixa/Litoral) opposition is posited.[5]

Despite this broad division, and the obvious presence of innumerable regional dialect characteristics in the Portuguese territory, a *língua comum* made its appearance. Since this concept will be of considerable importance in our discussion of the Portuguese of Brazil, it may be useful to define the term as a level of language consciously selected for general intercourse, more broadly employed than in local or familiar speech, and purged of certain characteristics identified as or presumed to be of limited currency. This is the language which, with the optional admixture of personal stylistics or the occasional deliberate introduction of specifically regional elements, provides the basis of the written language, and which is at the same time the national instrument for and result of social unity. The urban concentration is generally accorded an important role in the generation of the língua comum or língua-padrão, since it attracts speakers of many regional dialects and places them in intimate contact with each other, and since it provides, once the machinery is set in motion, a linguistic prestige pattern related to social category. The urban pattern rejects the continuous infiltration of provincial characteristics by the powerful weapon of ridicule, and offers the equally powerful leveling incentive of social acceptability. The concepts of "correct" or "pure" language cannot be applied in this context (and, furthermore, are extremely difficult to apply in any linguistic context). The urban norm generated under the circumstances described will certainly differ appreciably from the pattern to be observed in another area which may have a greater historical claim to the title of direct descendancy from the original language.[6] Since the "best" pronunciation is that which does not reveal a specifically identifiable regional origin, the pronunciation of the urban amalgam is generally preferred. In Portugal, as in Spain, the Reconquest brought a mixture of regional dialects to the South; in urban centers (Lisboa and Sevilla), this mixture was blended in the XII and XIV Centuries; and from these centers the language was exported to the New World.[7] In short, the Portuguese of Lisbon had become the _língua_ _padrão_, at least for literary prose, by the end of the XIV Century.[8]

The XV and XVI Centuries witnessed the explosive expansion of Portuguese. We propose to consider the Brazilian aspect of this expansion separately, in another section. The prophetic voice of João de Barros, however, is pertinent:

> "As armas e padrões portugueses postos em
> África e em Ásia, e em tantas mil ilhas fora
> da repartição das três partes da terra,
> materiais são e pode-os o tempo gastar.
> Mas não gastará doutrina, costumes, linguagem,
> que os Portugueses nestas terras deixarem."[9]

The first wave of expansion was directed to the Açores and Madeira around 1430; and these islands later were to supply colonists for the Portuguese territories, including Brazil.[10] The next wave of expansion, including the African coast, from Cabo Branco to Cabo Verde, took place from 1441 (Nuno Tristão reaches Cabo Branco) to 1470 (discovery of Islands of Ano-Bom, São Tomé and Príncipe). Portuguese settlements were established and consolidated along the coast of Africa; the traffic in slaves, so significant in the population of Brazil, was initiated and expanded; and the first falar-crioulo was created.[11] A primary source of supply for Portuguese (and later, Spanish) slave-traders was Angòla, where a crioulo-Portuguese was in general use.

A detailed description of the expansion of Portuguese into India and the Orient is beyond the scope of this study. Suffice it to point out that Gôa, as an administrative center for Portuguese trade, was in many respects a small-scale Brazil; with extensive intermarriage, a slave element (Cafre natives from Moçambique), Jesuit teaching, and a well developed Portuguese élite. The presence and influence of the Portuguese language in the Orient is seen in the creation of a widespread língua-franca and the existence of Portuguese words in Modern Japanese.[12]

For the third phase of this study (Differentiation and Conservation), we shall confine our attentions to Brazil and to those external currents and influences which have affected the evolution of Brazilian Portuguese.

A few general considerations on the nature of language, and, more specifically, on the identification and definition of language levels, may be useful. While it is not our purpose to develop a theory of language, it is clear that it is a) a cultivated product of social organization, and that b) it exists at several levels simultaneously as determined by interaction of social forces, with a varying degree of vertical movement dependent upon the applicable index of social mobility.

In any analytical or comparative study of a language, it is convenient to identify the language level to be subjected to study. If we accept the view that language is importantly, if not primarily, a social instrument, and that layers or levels of language exist in parallel with the social stratification of the linguistic area involved, then it becomes critically important to identify the specific levels of language to be selected for the analysis of Brazilian Portuguese.[13]

In the broadest terms, we may divide language into two major manifestations: A) Written and B) Oral. This would seem to be a self-evident division; yet a great deal of linguistic data has been produced without sufficient definition of the forms as to their occurrence in speech or writing. Even more significantly, much linguistic material extracted from written sources (usually from the past) have been equated with material drawn primarily from speech patterns (usually of the present). We shall argue for a greater validity for the written form of the language than the linguist is disposed to grant; but there cannot be a comparison of oral-written forms without a careful consideration and evaluation of the corrective factors involved in the latter (i.e. written) form. These corrective factors are extremely complex, since they would necessarily include the consideration of the socio-linguistic structure of the period, or the comparative analysis of the structures of each period, if we propose a diachronic study. This analysis will give attention to the language stratification patterns applicable: what is the nature and extent of the breach between the "cultivated" speech and the"natural" speech; what is the current academic influence of puristic grammatical theory and classical patterns exercised upon the patterns of the written language; what is the degree of contact and interpenetration of the uneducated class and its speech patterns with those of the highly literate; and what is the relationship and attitude of the literary interpreter toward the several social layers of his society? It seems quite clear that the literature-speech relationship in Brazil has altered radically in several well-defined periods of Brazilian history. We shall discuss these periods below.

All of the major divisions of language which we have mentioned involve several sub-divisions, each with identifiable characteristics. Some of these sub-classes, clearly susceptible of linguistic analysis, have received very little attention from linguists. It is certainly possible that at least one element of the resistance which language shows to the development of useful analysis in certain areas (for example, in automatic translation efforts) is the failure of "lump" analysis, or the analysis of language of different levels as a simple body of linguistic data, to produce valid structural patterns or models.[14]

The written language may be classified as

(a) Informational. The primary objective is transmission of information. Quantitatively speaking, this class will include the bulk of the written language, consisting of letters, reports, advertising, announcements, notices, journals, and newspapers (with some exceptions for portions of the last two categories). Many news reports, lectures and other material delivered orally from written scripts should also be included in this category. It has been widely recognized that professional "radio" speech has developed a characteristic style and pronunciation; it is quite likely that it also displays characteristic syntactical and/semantic usage. The language of journalism, which has even generated a name ("Jornalese"), also has an individual personality.[15] As far as this writer is aware, no detailed syntactical comparison exists which might show structural divergencies between newspaper and literary or other styles.

(b) Literary. The literary style injects an element of personal choice and contrived esthetic effect not prominent in the informational level. It seems certain that this process of selection affects the structure of language at several levels. A literary "style" must surely be susceptible of analysis along

> traditional linguistic lines (i.e., semantics, morphology, syntax). Since a literary style is a total effect composed of a great many elements, quantitative data will be required for a "base" language level (perhaps the "informational" level), in order to establish the nature of the divergencies quantified for the literary form.

The literary language may be subdivided into (1) Poetry and (2) Prose. Once again, we establish a division which is apparently self-evident and unproductive. The distinction becomes useful, however, when we observe that a great deal of structural data and many syntactical principles for Portuguese have been extracted from poetry and adduced as proof of the validity of certain forms for use in literary prose or even for speech.[16] Poetic language is a very special, highly regulated literary form, operating under complex restrictions, yet intimately related to the oral language. The linguistic norms of standard oral or written language are not to be derived from poetry, since poetry is by its very nature a departure from these norms.

Literary prose in our classification is defined by its suprainformational aspects. It will variously give emphasis to the identification of the individual personality of the author, or strive to create an emotional impact. The writer of literary prose is also concerned with the transmission of information, of course: he must communicate with his readers by the use of an instrument which operates under definite restrictions. Among these restrictions is the anonymity of the consumer: the writer can assume only that his reader is literate; the author knows nothing of the consumer's personal tastes or precise socio-linguistic standing.[17] The writer must also cope with the physical separation from the reader; he will consequently lack the situational context and its continuous responsiveness of the interlocutor to guide him in his presentation. A further and related operational problem for the writer is the determination of the degree of redundancy required in the formulation of his message. Since he has no personal reactions from his "receiver" (the nod, the gesture of assent, the puzzled frown, the lifted eyebrow, etc), the "transmitter" must analyze his message in order to provide the degree of reinforcement required. The message must be intelligible to a group of individuals, each of whom has his own unique set of linguistic experience. The writer must consequently employ the forms needed to reduce ambiguity and to span the collective range of individual variation.[18]

The result of the production sequence described is essentially a normalization of the language. The writer produces material which has been subjected to a reduction process: he produces, in short, the língua-padrão, or the nearest accessible approximation of the normalized or "standard" language. The exceptions which will readily occur to those acquainted with contemporary Brazilian literature do not destroy the validity of this reasoning: a Mário de Andrade at the beginning of Modernism and a João Guimarães Rosa in the contemporary period are surely exceptional, and ipso facto atypical examples.[19]

The second main division of language is the oral form. A few general observations on our concept of the nature of the spoken language versus the written language may be useful at this point.

It has become a commonplace to refer to the oral form of a language as "the" language; as the only form linguistically valid; and as the only form with a real existence. This postulate, indeed, has served a useful purpose in the evolution of modern linguistic theory, since it directed attention away from traditional Latin-based syntactical analysis and toward the development of new techniques required for the analysis of directly-observed linguistic phenomena. It appears that this exclusivistic attention given to the oral language was partially an outgrowth of the full realization that letters and words are no more than conventional representations of oral forms. To be sure, additional conventional representational systems were developed in the form of phonetic and phonemic transcriptions. These systems have the undeniable advantage of economy and precision; but since a symbol cannot be the sound, they are essentially no less conventional than the traditional letters or script. Furthermore, the point may be made that the oral form of the language is also highly conventional. The printed word is not speech, it is true; but the spoken word is not the thing. It may even be argued that the spoken word does not exist; that it is in fact an idealization, having as many variant forms (semantic as well as phonetic) as there are speakers. It may be held that the spoken word represents its referent only in terms of the linguistic experience of the receiver; and since the acoustic existence or "reality" of the spoken word is limited to the fractional moment of its utterance, the written word may well possess a higher degree of reality and a more definite and precise semantic impact.[20]

For a situation in which the written language bears a close relationship to the oral form, in which there is a clear and active exchange between the literary and popular levels, the langue-parole dichotomy loses much of its validity and usefulness. The concept of the written language as a pale and artificial reflection of the "actual" language (speech) is vulnerable and of dubious analytical merit in a situation such as that which obtains in contemporary Brazil. The written language, of course, provides the enormous advantage of accessibility and permanence. As we have indicated above, the writer normally produces a broad form, a common denominator of a range of variations, in order to ensure intelligibility. He thus produces an idealization of speech. In comparison, the spoken language in its pristine state is virtually impossible to capture and preserve. The tape recorder, naturally, is useful, especially if miniaturized and used for the production of clandestine recordings. The informal or guided interview, in our opinion, does not produce valid data, for many reasons. A multitude of inhibiting factors are simultaneously inserted into the speech situation. Furthermore, unless all of the linguistic information is recorded and preserved (gestures, facial expressions, attendant circumstances, inter-personal relationship of speakers), the data will be incomplete, if not invalid.

It is difficult to accept Macêdo Soares' point of view in his stricture: "Já é tempo dos brasileiros escreverem como se fala no Brasil, e não como se escreve em Portugal."[21] But it is equally difficult to accept Vendryès' statement: "Contrairement a l'opinion de bien de gens, on n'écrit jamais comme on parle; on écrit (ou l'on cherche à écrire) comme les autres écrivent."[22] Perhaps one writes, or at least many Brazilians write, as they would wish to speak. In summation: while it is undeniable that the oral form of language has a real existence, it is so fleeting, and is found in such complex situations that it may almost be said that it is the parole which does not exist (in the sense of durational existence); only the langue.[23]

If one does not have access to the langue, since it is manifestly impossible to assemble the totality of the language in all of its manifestations, and if the parole is equally difficult to isolate and examine, we are left with the necessity of a partial analysis. The characteristics of the written language, in our opinion, are such that a judiciously selected sample will bring us as close to the language as possible under the circumstances.

The writer has not observed that adequate attention has been given by linguists to the enormously increased impact and influence of the printed word on the modern-day speakers of the language. Universal education and increased literacy have made possible a truly staggering consumption of journalistic prose (newspapers and magazines). The per-capita distribution of literary prose has also increased; but informational prose, comparatively speaking, represents a quantity and degree of oral-written linguistic contact which must have important implications for the appropriate analysis of contemporary language.

It is interesting to observe that the early Portuguese chroniclers of the XV and XVI centuries, so influential in the development and evolution of the Portuguese language as a literary instrument, were quite conscious of language levels, and were equally aware of the fact that they were making a distinct contribution to the formation and enrichment of a língua-padrão.[24] The earliest Portuguese grammarians were also quite sensitive to the problems of the establishment and definition of a linguistic norm. The Grammática of Fernão de Oliveira, published in 1536, was the first such treatise, and gives evidence of a remarkably enlightened concept of language as the sum total of individual speakers; and the later grammar of João de Barros, who was awarded a capitania in Brazil, provided a succinct definition of the "standard" language as "... hũ modo certo e justo de falar e escrever colheito do uso e autoridade dos barões doutos."[25]

In view of our belief that there is an exceptionally high degree of interpenetration of language levels in contemporary Brazil, and the lack of definition or recognition of such levels in many linguistic studies, the classification of oral language categories is of considerable importance.

Manuel de Paiva Boléo presents "...supomos pela primeira vez em Portugal"[26] the following division: a) *linguagem corrente falada*, "a linguagem normalmente correcta entre pessoas de classe média, dotadas de certa instrução;" b) *linguagem familiar*, "distingue-se da anterior em usar de expressões que, na linguagem corrente, repugnariam ao sentido estético e à sensibilidade de certas camadas sociais;" c) *linguagem popular*, "aqui já não é só o vocabulário que varia; há também particularidades morfológicas e sintácticas."[27] The classification presented by S. da Silva Neto in several of his studies published later than the Paiva Boléo analysis is more useful: a) *linguagem corrente falada*, "é a língua normalmente correta, praticada entre pessoas da classe média, dotadas de certa instrução;" b) *linguagem popular*, "a linguagem das pessoas humildes, das classes mais modestas da sociedade: o meio é pobre e acanhado: a percentagem de analfabetos é muito grande;" c) *linguagem dialetal*, "é aquela que, relativamente a um tipo considerado padrão -- ou seja a *língua comum* -- dispõe de menos prestígio social e uso mais restrito."[28]

The phases of a linguistic evolution are intimately related to the cycle of literary movements; and, logically, both arise from and are the reflections of the alternations within a socio-historical complex which defies complete analysis.

The colonial period in Brazil, for example, represents a clear linguistic as well as political extension of the mother country. Superficially, the culture of the Brazilian élite was a transplanted culture, imported from Portugal and reinforced by regular infusions of colonists and the University training received in Portugal by the sons of culturally influential Brazilian families.[29] It may be useful, in this connection, to review some of the cultural phases or periods proposed for Brazil.

Silva Neto distinguishes three phases in the linguistic evolution of Brazil, and correlates these phases to the chief social transformation of the entire period: "a progressiva ascensão social do mestiço com as conseqüentes alterações no tipo da linguagem."[30] The first period dates from the colonization (1532) to the expulsion of the Dutch (1654); the second, from the latter date to the arrival of the Prince Regent (1808); and the third, from 1808 to the present. The chief characteristics of each period are as follows: the first half-century (1532-1590), characterized by a very limited population of brancos, and the creation of the mameluco[31] of indian and Portuguese blood; from 1590-1600, the influence of the negro slave is manifested in Bahia and Pernambuco, the língua geral grows in importance and currency, and the first organized efforts are made to transmit academic

Portuguese to the children of the colonists and to a limited number of representatives of the gentio.[32]

During the second phase (1654-1808), the importation of Negro slaves grew apace, and the presence of this racial element became more significant; the Negro element itself was basically divisible into two types: the negro ladino and the negro boçal. The Portuguese language began to be fused into a homogeneous medium in the crucible of the urban centers, and the língua geral slowly began to lose its currency in large areas of Brazil.[33]

The third period proposed by Silva Neto (1808-Present) includes the tremendous social and political impact of the establishment of the seat of the Empire in Brazil. The urban concentrations grew in importance as the centers of culture, and the linguistic leveling effect of the metropolitan melting-pot increased with the inward flow of representatives of all linguistic levels and the outward expansion of the influence of the metropolis as a norm and standard for culture and language. The remnants of the língua geral, chiefly in São Paulo and Maranhão, disappeared, and, with an urban-regional distribution and differentiation, linguistic unity exists in Brazil.[34]

Renato Mendonça, in his O português do Brasil, suggests the following division: I. Prehistoric Phase (1826-1879);

II. Historico-Ethnographic Phase (1879-1920); and III. Dialectological Phase (1920-Present). The first phase includes the first scattered and brief reference to the "Brazilian accent," and the first compilations of brasileirismos; the second, the debate concerning the Brazilian "dialect;" the third, the chief studies of several regional dialects of Brazil.[35]

Alceu Amoroso Lima, in his Quadro sintético da literatura brasileira, presents an analysis of Brazilian literature in three main divisions: I. Colonial (1550-1830); II Imperical (1830-1890); and III. Modern (1890-Present). In addition, he subdivides the Modern period into: A. Simbolista (1890-1900); B. Pre-Modernism (1900-1920); and C. Modernism (1920-Present); further, Modernism is analyzed as consisting of the following phases: 1. Pre-Modernism (1900-1920), 2. Modernism (1920-1930); 3. Post-Modernism (1930-1945); and 4. Neo-Modernism (1945-Present).[36]

Joaquim Mattoso Câmara, in a recent work, has analyzed the evolution of linguistic studies in Brazil, in two principal divisions: I. Past (to 1940) and II. Present (1940-to date). The chief concern of the first period was to establish the structure and norms of the língua padrão, and was characterized by the classic procedures of grammatical analysis; the second period represents a continuation of the classic approach, but with greater flexibility and the introduction of some elements of modern Linguistics according to the following subdivisions in each Phase: 1. Literary Norm; 2. Grammatical Theory; 3. Philological Research; 4. Phonetic Studies; and 5. Dialect Studies.[37]

Despite the manifest impossibility of assigning precise dates to the several elements of a continuum such as the evolution of a language, and with the limited purpose of giving some structural pattern to our comments, we propose the following analytical division for the history of Brazilian Portuguese: I. Pre-Colonial (1500-1550); II. Colonial (1550-1800); III. Imperial (1800-1900); and IV. Nationalistic (1900-Present). We are aware of the lack of precise correspondence between certain historical events and the dates cited; but we wish to advert to the "mentality" or psychological orientation of the periods rather than to the precise dates of historical periods.

I. Pre-Colonial. Our comments above indicate that the first Portuguese contact with Brazil introduced a Portuguese language which had already received the stamp of a national identity. Excluding the Galician lyric element, the structural and lexical characteristics of narrative Portuguese were fashioned by the Portuguese chroniclers of the XIV and XV Centuries, and a certain uniformity or homogeneity existed in the form of a dominant Lisbon dialect.

It is difficult to provide a precise description of the characteristics of early XVI Century Portuguese. A considerable body of data concerning the lexical and syntactical features of the literary language or *língua-padrão* is available in the *Crônicas* and in the *Gramáticas* of João de Barros and Fernão de Oliveira. A good summary of the morphology and phonetic features of pre-Colonial Portuguese is found in Serafim da Silva Neto, *História da língua portuguêsa*. Briefly, it may be said that Peninsular Portuguese has experienced a radical transformation since the XVI Century, while the Insular and Overseas dialects have tended to preserve linguistic features characteristic of the Portuguese language at the time of the maritime expansion and subsequently lost to the mother tongue.[38]

The earliest descriptive accounts of Brazil contain little information on language, save for an occasional reference to a *brasileirismo*. It is reasonable to presume however, that the Portuguese brought to Brazil by the first colonists immediately began to depart from the Peninsular norms, and that the mother tongue continued its evolution along a divergent path. It is natural that the effect of this divergence was to be noted only after it had proceeded for an appreciable period of time, and after it had produced a certain number of linguistic clashes. The process must have proceeded very slowly during the first period, due to the continual influx of Portuguese colonists from Portugal (as opposed to the later Island immigration), and the relative numerical predominance of newly arrived colonists as compared with the number of those already exposed to the new clime and the brancos da terra, or Portuguese born in Brazil. As the ratio of Brazilianized colonists to the influx of colonists was increased, and the percentage of the former became numerically dominant, the evolutionary process of Brazilian Portuguese must have accelerated.[39]

From the lexical point of view, there is no doubt that the Brazilian flora and fauna and indigenous culture began to contribute immediately after the discovery to the Portuguese language. An epístola of the Padre Manuel de Nóbrega (1549) is said to contain the first recorded brasileirismo: the word moqueada (meat prepared on the moquém, or grill (from the Tupi mboka'i)?); and pindá (from the Tupi pi'dá, "hook") is listed by Francisco Antônio Pigafeita, chronicler of the expedition of Fernão de Magalhães, which reached Brazil in 1519.[40] Later, many listings of lexical brasileirismos will appear, drawn from or supplemented by the regional and indigenista novel and folklore studies. We shall refer to some of these sources in a later section of this study.

The study and analysis of the comparative evolution of Peninsular and Brazilian Portuguese during the Pre-Colonial and Colonial periods (1500-1800), before the attentions of scholars were directed upon this question, remains to be accomplished. It is doubtful that it would be possible to isolate the immigration effect and other variables to achieve for each of several periods a corpus of data for comparative analysis. The corpus would of course consist of written material (except for an occasional possibility of an oral approximation, as in the *Sermões* of Padre Antônio Vieira). Another difficult factor would be the isolation or neutralization of the effect of the Peninsular University training received by many Brazilian intellectuals during this period.[41]

II. *Colonial* (1550-1800). As we have indicated, logic compels us to assume that the Portuguese of Brazil and the Portuguese of Portugal began a dual divergence at the moment of their separation; this divergence, however, was partially arrested by the continuing influx of Peninsular colonists. We would not wish to create the impression that a new language was being forged in Brazil. The significant feature of this assumption concerning the evolution of Portuguese in Brazil is that it proceeded unperceived for a very considerable period during the Colonial epoch, and that it eventually created a division between the *língua padrão* and the *linguagem* transmitida. The "standard" or academic form of the language, as presented and preserved in the literary efforts of Brazilians whose academic training was received in Portugal, and as reinforced by the Portuguese professors in Brazilian schools, eventually came into conflict with the patterns of the oral language as it had developed in Brazil. The tension created by this conflict of language styles and the widening gulf between the normal or "comfortable" patterns of the native Brazilian style and the sense of an artificiality and restriction in the superimposition of Peninsular norms resulted in the linguistic rebellion of Romanticism and the revolution of Modernism. These movements were in part an effort to reduce the gap between the formal (academic) and the informal (colloquial) levels of the language, in order to restore an equilibrium between the natural or spontaneous patterns of the povo and the cultivated patterns of the doutos. It is only with the overt reaction that the condition resulting from the differentiation process was recognized; it is clear however, that the process had been under way for generations.[42]

The Colonial period under discussion, in fact, must have served as the formative period for Brazilian Portuguese. The linguistic strata which came into existence during this period are rather complex. As a preliminary step, with full recognition of the interpenetration and reciprocal influences of the several language layers, we may list the linguistic components and their corresponding social groups separately.

1. _The Portuguese élite_. Principally located along the coastal band of Brazil, the _élite branca_ represented a standard Portuguese, preserving insofar as possible all of the norms of the Peninsular _língua padrão_. This is the _língua dos senhores_ to which Gilberto Freyre alludes; and as we have pointed out previously, it is maintained by a constant infusion of Portuguese colonists, by Jesuit instruction in the schools, and by the subsequent Peninsular University training of the sons of the _senhores_.

A concept of considerable importance for the Brazilian Portuguese of this period is the leveling effect, or _nivelação_, which becomes a major feature of Silva Neto's analysis; the fusion of individual idiolects in a closed and close-knit linguistic community into an "averaged" language seems to be a reasonable assumption, and would establish two important conclusions: a) the "averaged" speech patterns of the first colonial entity would necessarily differ from those of the mother country, since no similar variety of individual characteristics would exist there for the _nivelação_ process (a different urban fusion would of course occur); and b) this closed linguistic community would be virtually immune to the influence of the indigenous and Negro language elements by reason of its social cohesiveness.

2. The *língua geral*. The *língua geral* is essentially identical to the major indigenous language of coastal Brazil, the Tupi. It is unquestionably due to the missionary activities and proselytizing zeal of the Jesuits that the Tupi tongue became the general medium of communication between the Portuguese and mamelucos and the indigenous tribes.[44] The use of the Tupi-Guarani, or *Nheengatú* ("língua boa") in the North and the *Abanheenga* ("língua de gente") in the South, apparently was not limited to Portuguese-Indian contacts, but became a kind of second language. The many other Indian dialects, known as the *línguas travadas*, had little contact with Portuguese.[45] The principal early Indian-Portuguese contacts were in the North of Brazil (Bahia-Pernambuco) and the South (Rio de Janeiro/ Espírito Santo and São Paulo). The *língua geral* seems to have persisted in the South, where an essentially *mameluco* society was dominant until the "gold rush" of the late XVIII Century brought an influx of white Brazilian and foreign adventurers. Since the unadaptable indigenous component of the more modern centers (Rio-Bahia) declined sharply in numbers, to be replaced by the Negro, the Indian-Portuguese contact area moved to the interior. An island of *língua geral* persisted in Maranhão, an area settled later than the principal centers mentioned.[46]

The statistics concerning the Indian and Negro components of the early colonial settlements are uncertain. Of greater linguistic significance than the exact numbers, however, is the general relationship of the colonists and the indigenous tribes. The comparatively large concentration of Indians in Bahia, for example, does not imply an intimate linguistic contact between Portuguese and Indian tongues. The natives were separated from the urban area and concentrated in villages administered by the Jesuits; the relationship of the língua geral and Portuguese was not as "domestic" (i.e., coexisting under the same roof or within the family group) as that of the crioulo-português of the Negro and the Portuguese of the brancos or senhores. In general, although the variant statistics inject a note of uncertainty, the early concentration of índios began to diminish in the XVI Century, as the indigenous element returned to the wilds or was decimated by disease. The official prohibition of intermarriage of Indian and Negro slaves (1561), and of the brancos with Indian or Negro; and the abolition of Indian slavery (1566) were laws that were not fully accepted or effective, of course. The net result of the relationship of Tupi and Portuguese, however, was that the língua geral was employed primarily in a unidirectional manner (as an acquired language employed by speakers of Portuguese in order to deal with the Indians), or as a medium of internal communication within the Indian communities. Active interaction of the two languages on a basis of equality doubtless occurred between lower-class (i.e., illiterate or semi-illiterate) Portuguese and mamelucos and the native tribes; the limited linguistic effect of this interaction was probably eradicated from the Portuguese element by the school and academic instruction in the Portuguese language. A precise analysis of the influence of the língua geral on the Portuguese language as spoken in Brazil has not been made, and may well be impossible in view of the lack of data. On the basis of information available to this observer, the Tupi influence on Brazilian Portuguese is limited to the lexical contribution (extensive and significant, but without effect on the basic structures of the language), and a possible influence on intonation and pronunciation which as yet has not been demonstrated in a convincing manner.

3. The crioulo-Portuguese. We use the word crioulo here to refer to the Portuguese spoken by the Negro slave in Brazil.[47] The two chief African groups represented in Brazil were the Bantu (from Angola) and the Sudanese, representing respectively various dialects of quimbundo and nagô (yoruba).

In view of the overwhelming numerical superiority of the Negro slaves and crioulos (here, used in the sense of Negroes born in Brazil), it is important to bear in mind that the native African dialects did not predominate in the slave class. Not only were several African languages represented in the group, but a large number arrived in Brazil speaking a modified form of Portuguese. Those who spoke only an African tongue were considered to be socially inferior within the slave community, and were naturally less valuable as chattel property to their owners.[48] The lack of a dominant African dialect in combination with the considerable interaction of the Portuguese with the Indians in the early Colonial period probably led to the establishment of Tupi as the general language of communication for all elements of Brazilian society. The linguistic effects of the several all-African settlements, or quilombos, established by runaway slaves were negligible, since the homogeneity was isolated during its effective period and disappeared with the destruction and dispersion of the settlements.[49]

The Imperial Period (1800-1900). The nineteenth century witnessed the rapid development of significant divergencies between Peninsular Portuguese and the Brazilian "dialect." The friction between the classic linguistic molds of the Peninsula, as modified by comparatively accelerated processes of phonetic change, and the Brazilian variety of Portuguese, relatively unaffected by these phonetic shifts, became apparent. The awareness of a Brazilian modality is recorded by several observers of the period. One of the earliest references to this growing linguistic separation is found in a French work by Domenico Borges do Barro, Visconde de Pedra Branca, in 1826. With reference primarily to lexicon, he cites some 49 Brazilian Portuguese words unknown to Portugal, refers to the widespread use of diminutives in Brazil, and reports that the Portuguese of Brazil is affected by the climate and character of its people.[50]

The growing sense of a separate identity for the Portuguese of Brazil is seen in a reference by Francisco Adolfo de Varnhagem, Visconde de Porto Seguro in 1850, who refers to an accent peculiar to Brazil, and ascribes it to Spanish influence.[51] The first attempt to describe the characteristics of Brazilian Portuguese in a systematic manner, however, was that of José Jorge Paranhos da Silva: _O idioma do hodierno Portugal comparado com o do Brazil. Por um Brazileiro_ (Rio de Janeiro, 1879). Paranhos da Silva states that his study is not intended for his "primos" in Portugal, but for the "macacos" (i.e., Brazilians living or studying in Portugal). He takes particular exception to some remarks made by Teófilo Braga about Brazilian Portuguese, and in general presents the thesis that Peninsular Portuguese has suffered recent phonetic and syntactical changes which had not been exported to Brazil; and that, consequently, the Brazilian forms criticized by Braga were more legitimate and defensible than the so-called correct Peninsular variants.

One of the earliest Brazilian men of letters to become sensitized to the abnormality of prescribing and maintaining rigid Peninsular norms for the instrument utilized to portray Brazilian reality and to express Brazilian sentiments was Gonçalves Dias, who combined a nature sensitive to the characteristics of his native Maranhão with appreciable periods spent in Portugal.[53] Surprisingly, Gonçalves finds the Portuguese of the Peninsula less exposed to European trends and ideas (and the linguistic borrowings required to express these thoughts) than the Brazilians.[54] In summary, the poet is convinced that the Portuguese of Brazil will suffer major transformations, but that the basic structure of the language should be respected; despite his personal reaction, he recommends study of the classics, without proscribing anything needed to express Brazilian thoughts or describe Brazilian reality.[55] Gonçalves also felt that the Tupi had exercised a great influence on Brazilian Portuguese; but it seems fairly clear that he had reference to lexical rather than phonetic or syntactical influences, even though the divergency of Brazilian Portuguese in these areas must have been readily observable.[56]

In the final phase of Romanticism (decade of the 1870's), a double opposition to Brazilian linguistic innovation manifests itself, in the form of the purists' objections to the neologisms and departures from classic syntactical patterns, as well as in the opposition of the new wave of Realism and Naturalism to the Romantic indianismo. Since one of the characteristics of Brazilian Romanticism involved the depiction of indigenous customs and speech, the friction with Brazilian Naturalists and both Brazilian and Peninsular purists was clear-cut. In 1867, in a critical article on Iracema, the epochal indianist novel by José de Alencar, the Peninsular writer Pinheiro Chagas excoriates the "falta de correção" of the language of the novel, and registers an intemperate protest against the innovations of Brazilian Portuguese. Alencar's reply was moderate, reasonable, and convincing.[57] Space limitations do not permit the reproduction of this multi-faceted polemic, involving several series of articles. The concept of a separate identity for Brazilian Portuguese (as a dialect or a separate language) and the most obvious syntactical divergency of the new world Portuguese - the position and use of object pronouns - were introduced, and were to become the subject of many thousands of pages of commentary by dozens of commentators on both sides of the Atlantic.[58]

IV. Nationalistic Period (1900-Present). During the latter part of the 19th century and the early years of the 20th, the search for brasileirismos was intensified by a separatistic psychology, and was fortified by the proposed "dialect," or national "language" status for Brazilian Portuguese. A large number of separate compilations of regional terms was produced during this period.[59] These vocabularies or dictionaries of Brasilianisms are supplemented by an appreciable body of literature emphasizing regional language and culture.[60]

The nationalist period witnessed the completion of the process of self-identification of Brazil as an autonomous political, literary and linguistic entity; this period also embraces the extended contest between the Portuguese and Brazilian puristic grammarians and the Brazilian vernaculists, with final victory going to the latter by virtue of the overwhelming energies of Modernism. In retrospect, it would seem that excessive enthusiasm of the Brazilianists led to significant distortions in the analyses and descriptions of the nature of Brazilian Portuguese.[61] A survey of the data presented in the early treatises supporting separate dialect or language status for the Portuguese of Brazil indicates that nearly every characteristic offered as evidence of Spanish, African or Tupi influence on Brazilian is either confined to sub-standard or short-lived aberrant forms, or is in fact classic Portuguese preserved and retained in the colony, but lost to the mainland. This applies to both phonetic and syntactical language patterns.[62]

Despite the extensive analysis of the question, the word "dialect" does not seem to be an appropriate descriptive term for the linguistic situation of Brazil (or, for that matter, for the Spanish of Spanish America or the English of the U.S.A.). It is regularly ignored that the language brought to the New World was from its first moment of appearance a composite of several dialect areas of the homeland, where, for historical reasons, the term "dialect" was and remains useful and meaningful. Many dialectalisms were unquestionably brought to Brazil and prospered (i.e., achieved widespread acceptance and utilization), but were lost to standard Peninsular speech. It would be well, however, to exercise a certain degree of caution in the elimination of Brazilian origin or generation for all linguistic forms which can be observed in a Peninsular dialect. A language system contains all the elements for any one of its dialectal manifestations, and the selection of a given variant or departure from standard patterns may well be the result of a similar selection process. The loss of the redundant plural endings in sub-standard Brazilian Portuguese, for example (os olho for os olhos, etc.) may have no direct relationship to the presence of the same phenomenon in a given Peninsular dialect. It may represent simply a parallel exploitation of a linguistic possibility.

It is interesting to reflect on the effects and consequences of the extraordinary dualistic language development in Brazil. For with the stated purpose and specific objective of maintaining the linguistic unity (or, in fact, identity) of the Luso-Brazilian language, the puristic grammarians on both shores of the Atlantic were in fact contributing to the creation of a dual-language structure in Brazil: one, the _linguagem familiar_; the other, a _língua literária_, divorced from the evolutionary trends of Brazilian Portuguese and maintained as an artificial construct based on Peninsular norms. The absurdity of this effort was not apparent to the learned men involved, for several reasons. In the first place, the realization of a distinct and identifiable Brazilian mode of the Portuguese language was in general coetaneous with the organic theory of language. The study of the _fait accompli_ of the transformation of Vulgar Latin into the various Romance languages created the impression that an irresistible force had been at work. With no possible direct contact with or comprehension of the human being as a shaping force in this evolution, the philologist came to view the process as separate from the speakers of the language: a process which involved an inevitable cycle of birth, growth and decay, all in strict accordance with "laws." The laws were developed from observed original and end-result linguistic forms; the patterns thus derived were extended to deduce originals (hypothetical Vulgar Latin forms, for example) in cases where only the resultant was available. Only in reaction to the organic theory did language come to be considered as a social instrument, and as such the product as well as the mirror of a complex of social forces. The view of language as a reflection of a social spectrum allowed for the first time a comprehension of the validity of each of several language levels within a linguistic totality. This in turn allowed the utilization of colloquial and regional speech patterns as a valuable element in the representation of social types.[63]

Since the accurate representation of Brazilian reality, in a language generated by and comfortable in its milieu, was a key principle of the Modernist movement, the final phase of the evolution of Brazilian Portuguese is linked directly to this movement.[64] After the initial excesses, and especially in the Neo-Modernist period (1945 to the present), all remaining reservations on the validity of the vernacular were swept away. Constructions and usages which were daring in 1930 or impossible in 1900 are routinely accepted today. It is not unusual for contemporary literatures to employ realistic colloquial language; it is noteworthy in the case of Brazil, however, that the transition from formal to colloquial took place so rapidly, and that the process was so exceedingly thorough. There is scarcely a page of a contemporary Brazilian _conto_, _crônica_ or _romance_ which does not contain half-a-dozen constructions branded as incorrect or substandard a few years ago, and consequently proscribed from literary usage.[65]

It may be correctly inferred from the preceding references that both Peninsular and Brazilian language scholars were primarily concerned with investigations of a historical nature. Many of the studies are little more than compilations of classic citations; others emphasize subjective aspects of language usage and change. Nearly all scholars were concerned with establishing "correct" usage and the identification and extirpation of neologisms, gallicisms, and other "incorrect" forms. The Modernists, as noted, brought the vernacular to a position of respectability, but produced no grammatical theory or even monographic studies on the "new" language. The "Gramatiquinha da fala brasileira," once announced as forthcoming by Mário de Andrade, never appeared. The grammarians in general continued to emphasize formalism in the secondary manuals, as exemplified by the _Nomenclatura Gramatical Brasileira_, decreed as standard by the Ministry of Education and Culture in 1958, an attempt to stabilize terminology with no established underlying grammatical theory.

The reader will observe that the term "linguist" has been used sparingly in this survey. This is because there has been virtually no systematic linguistic research conducted in Brazil, by Brazilians, on the subject of Brazilian

Portuguese. I refer, of course, to modern descriptive linguistics and/or later analytical techniques. The chair of Linguistics was first established in the Universidade do Distrito Federal in 1937, and was eliminated in 1938 when it was re-designated the Faculdade Nacional de Filosofia, part of the new Universidade do Brasil. Linguistics was offered in Extension by the National College in 1942 and 1949; in 1950 Linguistics became a mandatory course for students in the College of Letters. The professor for all the courses cited, and the dean and prime mover in the development of Brazilian linguistic studies was Professor Joaquim Mattoso Câmara.[66]

In 1963, with the curricular control derived from the _Lei de Diretrizes e Bases_, the Brazilian government decreed mandatory instruction in Linguistics in all Faculties of Philosophy in Brazil. Aryon Rodrigues has termed this "uma medida desastrosa," since there were no professors trained in modern Linguistics available to offer the hundreds of courses created overnight. The result was in many cases that traditional grammar has been taught as "Linguistics."[67] The gradual development of Centers and Institutes of Linguistics, the active interest and participation of foreign scholars in the area of Brazilian Linguistics, and the recent Ford Foundation assistance to the improvement and expansion of Linguistic training have combined to produce a significant improvement in the quality and scope of scholarly studies in and concerning Brazilian Portuguese.

END

# NOTES

Citations in the *Notes* will ordinarily be abbreviated in name and title; the full entry will be found in the *Selective Bibliography* (see below, note 1).

[1] *A Selective Bibliography of Luso-Brazilian Linguistics*. Milwaukee, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee Language and Area Center for Latin America, 1966, 70 pp. A later version of this *Bibliography* may also be consulted: Revised Edition. Tallahassee, Florida State University, 1969. 85 pp. This version will be cited as: (1969 *Biblio*.).

[2] *A Selective Bibliography of Contemporary Brazilian Authors*. Milwaukee, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee Language and Area Center for Latin America, 1966, 57 pp.

[3] The formative period of the Portuguese language, of course, antedates the period designated. For data on the earliest manifestations of the Romance dialect, see Serafim da Silva Neto, *História da língua portuguêsa*; Claúdio Brandão, *Sintaxe clássica portuguêsa*; Silveira Bueno, *A formação histórica da língua portuguêsa*; Ismael de Lima Coutinho, *Pontos de gramática histórica*; Epifânio da Silva Dias, *Sintaxe histórica portuguêsa*; William J. Entwistle, *The Spanish Language*..with *Portuguese, Catalán and Basque*; Giacinto

Manupella, Os Estudos de filologia portuguêsa de 1930-1949 (for bibliography); Rodrigo de Sá Nogueira, Curso de filologia portuguêsa; José Joaquim Nunes, Compêndio de gramática histórica portuguêsa; Eduardo Carlos Pereira, Gramática histórica; J. Leite de Vasconcelos, Lições de filologia portuguêsa; and Edwin B. Williams, From Latin to Portuguese.

[4] Islands of non-integrated linguistic groups remained in Portugal, and Portuguese dialect areas persisted in Spanish areas. The presence of Leonese elements in Miranda and of Portuguese dialects in Spanish territories is explained by specific "foreign" settlements of areas depopulated by the Reconquest. See S. da Silva Neto, História, 367 pp.

It is difficult to imagine the scarcity of population in reconquered areas. D. Sancho I chartered many towns with 3 (sic) to 20 inhabitants (S. da Silva Neto, op. cit., p. 370). The repopulation project was emphasized by D. Sancho I, continued sporadically under D. Sancho II and D. Alfonso III, and was again given special attention by D. Denis; this in the late XII and early XIII centuries.

[5] According to an interpretation of the data supplied by Manuel de Paiva Boléo, Dialectologia e História da língua:

*Isoglossas Portuguesas* (Lisboa, 1950), also published in *Boletim de filologia* X (1951), pp. 1-44. The dialectal contrasts cited by S. da Silva Neto (*História*, p. 374-375) are the c/s; the v/b; the u/ui and the g/c.

[6] It is noteworthy that this urban norm is not the "native" or original language pattern of the area, but a blending of this prototype with the variety of dialect traits brought by the numerically superior regional immigrants. The classification of the "most correct" or "purest" language is a clearly subjective and elusive concept. It is reported, on the basis of a questionnaire, that Guarda is considered to represent the "purest" form of Peninsular Portuguese, with Coimbra in second place, followed by Lisboa. The elements or factors determining purity or correctness, however, cannot be precisely determined or defined (See M. de Paiva Boléo, *Brasileirismos*, p. 12).

[7] S. da Silva Neto concludes: "Lisboa é uma frágua de onde sai...uma média entre os falares do Norte e os falares do Sul... A essa conclusão somos chegados, mesmo sem o *Atlas Lingüístico* (que certamente a confirmará e melhor esclarecerá) com a ajuda de subsídios históricos e pela evidência de que os traços típicos dos falares do Norte (c, b/v, s/z, ss/c, nasais em -óum) foram diluídos no caminhar dos recon-

quistadores para o Sul, e não fazem parte da língua padrão." (*História*, p. 395). The resistance of a *língua comum*, even though not yet established, to regionalisms is apparent in citations from early anthologists, who apologize for the regionalisms they are reproducing; see S. da Silva Neto, *História*, p. 390.

[8] We prefer to limit this treatment of the *língua padrão* to the evolution of literary prose, for several reasons. The oral form of the language, of course, is inaccessible (save for some reflections in the works of Gil Vicente); and the extraordinary flowering of galego-português as a poetic instrument is largely peripheral to our discussion. In the numerous prose texts of the XV Century, according to the scholars, the evolution of Portuguese as a flexible and expressive instrument is apparent: in the *Livro de Montaria* of D. João I (1357-1433); in the *Leal Conselheiro* and the *Livro de ensinança de bem cavalgar tôda sela*, of D. João's son and successor, D. Duarte (1391-1438); and in the *Trauctado da Virtuosa Benfeyturia* of the Infante D. Pedro (1392-1449), we see a distinct effort to expand the expressive limits of Portuguese. S. da Silva Neto cites the following example from the Infante D. Pedro: "E os que menos letrados forem do que eu sou, nem se anojem d'alguas palavras latina-

das e termos scuros, que en taes obras se non poden escusar" (*História*, p. 405). The later works of Fernão Lopes (1380-1460) show Portuguese as a fully formed literary vehicle in the *Crônica de D. Fernando*, the *Crônica de D. João I* and the *Crônica de D. Pedro* (See Rodrigues Lapa, *Lições de literatura portuguêsa*; cited by S. da Silva Neto, *História*, p. 409); other prominent chronicles of the period were Ruy de Pina (1440-1521) with the *Crônicas* of D. Denis and D. Duarte, and Garcia de Resende (1470-1536), with the *Crônica de João II*. Gomes Eanes de Zurara was the first chronicler of the maritime expeditions: *Crônica dos feitos de Guiné*.

[9] João de Barros, *Diálogo em louvor da nossa linguagem*, as cited in Agostinho de Campos, *Futuro da língua*, p. 47.

[10] The emigration from the Açores was later to carry to Brazil elements of an ultra-conservative dialect of Portuguese, maintained in the Islands, relatively isolated from the Peninsula. The influence of this appreciable Azorean contingent in Northern Rio Grande do Sul is noted by M. de Paiva Boléo (*Brasileirismos*, pp. 70-72); the characteristics of Azorean Portuguese are described in Leite de Vasconcellos, *Açores, Mês de Sonho: Conspecto de Etnografia Açórica* (Lisbon, 1926).

[11] The first slaves (a contingent of 10) reached Portugal in 1442. The significant expansion of the Portuguese language along the African Coast produced the negro ladino who arrived in Brazil already speaking a variety of Portuguese; this as compared to the negro boçal who spoke only his native tongue. The African settlements apparently passed through several phases: the feitoria or initial contact, in which the língua franca appears. At this level, the language has the characteristics of an instrument for emergency communication. In the fazenda, or more permanent establishment, the Português-crioulo is formed. This is a language with continuity, characterized by simplified syntax. The colônia evolves from the fazenda, and represents a more complex social structure, a defined élite branca, and the mechanism for preservation of the language by local schools and books. In the colônia phase, the crioulo language will gradually disappear. For a discussion of the nature of crioulo languages, see S. da Silva Neto, História, pp. 430; and Adolfo Coelho, Dialectos (1969 Biblio). The falar crioulo is recorded very shortly after its creation in literary documents: the Cancioneiro de Resende and in the theatrical pieces of Gil Vicente. Several passages of this meia-língua are reproduced in S. da Silva Neto, op. cit., pp. 455-461.

[12] Thirty words in Japanese are said to be of Portuguese origin (*cóppu* from *copo*, *boro* from *bôlo*, *pan* from *pão*, etc.). Portuguese, on the other hand, possesses six words of Japanese origin, and an impressive 949 words of Asiatic origin (including *jangada*, from the Malaiala *changadam*). The extent of the expansion of Portuguese may be indicated very succinctly by listing the dialect areas as formulated by Leite de Vasconcelos:

- I. *Peninsular*
  - (1) Interamnense
  - (2) Trasmontano
  - (3) Beirão
  - (4) Meridional.

- II. *Insular*
  - (1) Açores
  - (2) Madeira.

- III. *Overseas*
  - (1) Brazilian
  - (2) Indo-Portuguese
    - (a) Diu
    - (b) Damão
    - (c) Norteiro
    - (d) Gôa
    - (e) Mangalor
    - (f) Canánor
    - (g) Mahé
    - (h) Cochin
    - (i) Coromandel.
  - (3) Ceylon

- (4) Macao
- (5) Malayo-Portuguese
  - (a) Java
  - (b) Malacca, Singapore.
- (6) Timor
- (7) Cape Verde
- (8) Guinea
- (9) Gulf of Guinea
  - (a) São Tomé
  - (b) Príncipe
  - (c) Ano Bom
- (10) African Coast
- (11) Jewish
  - (a) Amsterdam
  - (b) Hamburg

From Leite de Vasconcelos, Esquisse, 155 ff. Other important sources of information are Adolfo Coelho, Dialectos ( 1969 Biblio.); Sebastião Rodolfo Dalgado, (Various); Francisco Silveira Bueno, "Influência"; Manuel de Paiva Boléo, O estudo; Thomas R. Hart, "The Overseas Dialects"; and Francis M. Rogers, "Insular Portuguese".

To the dialects listed one might add the degenerated português-negro or Djoe-tongo originally spoken in Jewish plantation settlements of Surinam and the later *negro-inglês* or *taki-taki* of the same region, which contains many Portuguese elements. The *papiamento*, a *crioulo* dialect mixture of Portuguese-Spanish-Dutch in Curaçao, is yet another dialectal manifestation of Portuguese.

13 The oral patterns of Brazilian Portuguese are a faithful reflection of the social philosophy which has generated and accepted these patterns. In the broadest terms, the simplification of forms of address (from *o senhor* - *tu* - *você* to *o senhor* - *você*), the penetration of popular syntax into the speech patterns of the educated class (*vi êle*, *ouvi êle dizer*, *está na janela*, and many more), indicate a social class relationship or attitude typical of and perhaps unique to Brazil: a lack of rigidity and formalism in inter-class contacts. This does not mean that there is a high degree of social mobility in Brazil; for while the existing social barriers permit inter-class movement, the educational structure militates against such vertical currents. Extensive and intimate inter-class *contact* (as opposed to actual inter-class movement), however, is favored by the existing social patterns, principally the *babá* and *empregada* system. This places within nearly every household, in prolonged and intimate contact with the middle and upper class parents

and their children, numerous representatives of a near-illiterate and underprivileged class. Were it not for this aspect of Brazilian society, the educated élite would have little or fleeting contact with this layer of society. It seems reasonably clear that this social relationship is a prolongation of the patrão-escravo or casa grande-senzala relationship of an earlier period.

[14] One might compare the syntactical patterns of formal legal written Portuguese, for example, with the current colloquial patterns. Many complex structures (indeed, several basic elements of syntax), present in the highly formalized written language, are entirely lacking at the colloquial level; and this is true, even though the speaker at the colloquial level may be the author of the written style. We may cite the mesoclitic pronoun (Dir-se-ia), the combined pronouns (lho, mo, etc.), the use of the simple pluperfect (falara = tinha [or havia] falado), the use of the future and conditional tenses in general, the subjunctive-conditional hypothetical (se tivesse...daria): all of these structures, and others, present and active in formal style, are virtually absent from current colloquial style.

[15] Here, for Brazilian Portuguese, see the interesting study by Zdeněk Hampl: "Para o estudo da linguagem da imprensa

brasileira contemporânea," in *Revista Brasileira de Filologia* VI (1961), pp. 51-114.

[16] This is seen in an aggravated form in the history of the extended polemic concerning proper usage in Brazil. The Ruy Barbosa - Ernesto Carneiro Ribeiro dispute provides an incredibly voluminous example. The *anteprojeto* of the *Código Civil*, drawn up by Clóvis Bevilácqua in 1902, was sent to the National Congress for debate. The draft copy was submitted to Ernesto Carneiro Ribeiro, renowned professor of the *ginásio* in Bahia, for comments on style and language. Carneiro Ribeiro had only four days to examine the 2,000 articles of the code. As he reported: "Li todo o Projeto do Código; corrigi-lhe as faltas de linguagem, que mais me pareciam destacar-se e relevar-se."

The Code was then sent to the Senate for a critique by the noted orator, Ruy Barbosa, former student of Carneiro Ribeiro. Ruy commented extensively "em várias considerações filológicas, encontrando, como afirma, êrros de concordância, barbarismos, solecismos, dissonâncias, galicismos, ecos, pleonasmos, neologismos escusados, cacofonias e outras falhas na redação." Carneiro Ribeiro defended his stamp of approval in a treatise entitled *Ligeiras observações sôbre as emendas do Dr. Ruy Barbosa feitas à redação do Projeto do Código*

*Civil* (Bahia, 1902; published 1917). Ruy Barbosa's reply came swiftly in the *Réplica*, finished in 1902 and first published in the *Diário do Congresso* of August 10, 1903; later published by the Imprensa Nacional (1904: 600 pp.).

A reply came in the form of an even more voluminous tome by Carneiro Ribeiro: *Tréplica*: *A redação do Projeto do Código Civil e a Réplica do Dr. Rui Barbosa* (first published in 1905; and later: Bahia, Livraria Catilina, 1923. 900 pp.). It is difficult to conceive of a question of style or usage which was not involved in this polemic. In a very large number of examples, one party or the other invoked the authority of Luiz de Camões, principally from the epic poem *Os Lusíadas*. See Sílvio Elia, *Ensaios*, pp. 167-170.

[17] The writer may of course fashion his material expressly for consumption by an élite or highly limited group of consumers; this is exceptional.

[18] We do not refer to syntactical redundancy in the usual linguistic sense, but rather to a stylistic redundancy. One might point to the regional novel as an exception to this concern for an "averaged" language; but the regional novel usually includes a glossary, presented specifically to ensure intelligibility. Moreover, even the highly regionalistic

literature (the *indigenista* novel of José de Alencar or the contrived localisms of Mário de Andrade, for example) are said to be composed in a language 95% "classic," respecting all established norms.

[19] This is a critically significant conclusion for this study, which is based on written materials carefully selected to reflect the standard (or standardized) form of contemporary Brazilian Portuguese.

[20] We refer here to the increased reaction time available to the receiver of the written language. The moment of time consumed in the evocation of lexical or emotional reactions to key linguistic items in written communications is seldom available in the dialogue. It is well established that a great many written forms with a rich associational value are not available for oral use by a given speaker. The comparative poverty of ordinary oral communication is also well established, and is probably applicable to syntax as well as the lexicon. This is to say that significant sections of the corpus of a given language may be excluded from consideration by a concentration on the speech form.

[21] Antônio Joaquim de Macêdo Soares, *Dicionário*...*Prólogo* (apud S. da Silva Neto, *Introdução*, pp. 21-22).

[22] *Le langage*, p. 389 (apud S. da Silva Neto, *Introdução*, p. 22).

[23] One might compare the problems of the linguistic analysis of speech with the chemical analysis of a flame. The flame clearly exists, and produces observable phenomena, but resists analysis because it cannot be arrested for observation. It is not unusual for the linguist to select a single speaker of a language as an informant for the production of data to be analyzed. It is a near-certainty that this process provides a faulty and incomplete model, even though the data is taken from the "real" language (i.e., speech). The author's personal experience in basing the dialog material for a bsic text on the speech patterns of a single informant was very enlightening in this regard. When the native informant base was expanded to three or four, it was found that a great many constructions from the original material needed to be modified or replaced.

The following comparison of the oral-written (literary) language presented by S. da Silva Neto is pertinent:

> Conservadora e, portanto, de tendências arcaizantes, é a língua literária: ela seleciona, resiste às inovações, restaura formas, opõe um dique a tôda mudança. Em todos os povos civili-

> zados a língua literária, uma vez fixada, se mantém e perpetua relativamente estável. A língua falada, ao contrário, é, por natureza, móvel e flutuante: nela se entrechocam tendências e inovações, em permanente busca do equilíbrio. Logo, são contradições arcaico e vulgar. Como explicar, então, o inegável sabor antigo da língua falada? É que, em vez de arcaico e vulgar, devemos dizer antigo e regional. (História da língua portuguêsa, p. 115)

This notion of the oral language as a proving-ground for the testing of the validity (or, better, utility) of linguistic forms is a useful concept.

[24] The Infante D. Pedro (1392-1449), in the Trauctado da Virtuosa Benfeyturia, wrote as follows: "E os que menos letrados forem do que eu sou, nem se anojem d'alguas palavras latinadas e termos scuros, que en taes obras se non poden escusar." In addition to the Trauctado, S. da Silva Neto (História, pp. 407 ff.) cites the Livro de Montaria of D. João I (1357-1433), the Leal conselheiro and the Livro da ensinança de bem cavalgar tôda sela of King D. Duarte (1391-1438), the anonymous Boosco delleytoso (of the 15th Century), and, principally, the stylist Fernão Lopes (1380-

1460?) and his *Crônicas* (*de D. Fernando*, *de D. Pedro*, *de D. João I*).

[25] Apud S. da Silva Neto, *História*, p. 481. João de Barros also includes one of the earliest and most novel example for his rules of punctuation:

> "... muitas vezes os mesmos pontos lhe fazem sentir a verdade dela (qualquer escritura), como se pode ver nesta dição anfibológica: *Ler as obras de Lutero*: *nunca obedecer ao papa*, *é o mais seguro pera a salvação*.
>
> Como julgaremos estas palavras não serem heréticas? Com os pontos.... *Ler as obras de Lutero nunca*: *obedecer ao papa*, *é o mais seguro pera a salvação*. (*Gramática*, ed. J.P. Machado, p. 67)

João de Barros also gave attention to the problem of the *cacófato*, or the phonetic creation of an impolite or obscene word by juxtaposed syllables: a linguistic oddity later to become an incredibly important and ubiquitous issue in evaluation of poetic and narrative style:

> "... comete-se quando, do fim de ũa palavra

> e de princípio de outra, se faz alguma torpeza, como colhões tamanhos tem aquela lebre, por: que olhões tamanhos tem aquela lebre." (Gramática, ed. J.P. Machado, p. 50)

Fernão de Oliveira, who served at one time as the tutor for the children of the noble João de Barros, and who traveled in Spain and Italy, presents a clear picture of the linguistic spectrum of his time and of the vertical movement of linguistic elements. He describes at some length the distinction between the basic lexicon of Portuguese, the neologisms required by new knowledge, and regional dialects. The concept of language as a mechanism individually created by men and subject to modification by man, lost to linguistics for a considerable period, is well expressed by Fernão de Oliveira:

> "Cada hũ fala como quem é... Porẽ nã e tã espiritual a língua q não seja obrigada as leys do corpo. E não desconfiemos da nossa língua, porque os homẽs fazem a língua e não a língua os homẽs." (Gramática, ed. Rodrigo de Sá Nogueira, p. 17)

As a final note: according to the information available to me these two monuments of Portuguese syntax are preserved in a single copy each of the original editions: see Oliveira, *Grammática*, ed. R. da Sá Nogueira, *Preface*; and João de Barros, *Grammática*, ed. J.P. Machado, *Introduction*.

[26] In his study, *O perfeito e o pretérito em português* (1937), pp. XLI. A similar analysis appears in Agostinho de Campos, *Futuro da língua* (1948), p. 9.

[27] See *O perfeito e o pretérito em português*, pp. XLI-XLII. M. de Paiva Boléo also gives a division of the written language in the *língua escrita corrente* and *língua escrita cuidada*.

[28] See Serafim da Silva Neto: *Guia para estudos dialectológicos*, pp. 23-24; *Língua, cultura e civilização* pp. 253-254; and, chiefly his *Instrodução ao estudo da língua portuguêsa no Brasil*, pp. 18-20.

Silva Neto also identifies a *linguagem vulgar* (urban uneducated speech), *falares regionais* (regional dialects) and *gíria* (cant or slang). The classification of *linguagem corrente* apparently seemed too broad for Silva Neto, who later divides it into the *fala tensa* or *familiar*, influenced by the educated class and its *linguagem culta*; and the *falas vulgares* or *especiais*, relatively unaffected by the learned or academic language. The *fala vulgar* includes slang and highly colloquial expressions, and the *falas especiais* include the cant or jargon of professional and marginal social groups (see *Introdução*, pp. 26-28). The examples adduced for several of the categories proposed by Silva Neto, however, do not clarify his classification appreciably, since they are drawn from mixed linguistic categories (thus repeating in a different area the non-homogeneity of levels cited by Paiva Boléo). Silva Neto cites as examples of the *fala familiar*, in addition to proverbial expressions and adages, the following: *até loguinho*, *êlezinho*, *agorinha*, *bicança*, *grandessíssimo*, *bicota* (kiss), *pra*, *mobilhar*, *desencarrilhar*, *ôro*, *amolar*, *interim*, *azáfama*, *rũi*; for the *fala vulgar*, he gives: *adevogado* (and other similar examples), *muler*, *sube* (for *soube*?), *truxe*, *menas* (from *menos*), *trocê* (?), *semos*, *cair fora*, *dar o fora*, *pra xuxu*, *é na batata*, *dar o pira*, *safado*, *bonzão*, etc. We have here an interesting mixture of genuine archaisms and neologisms, and an equally interesting combination of figurative language, morphology, and phonetics (*pra* for *para* is tantamount to the citation of "wuz" and 'n (for "and") in English as sub-standard forms, when they are in fact no more than unconventional *orthographic* representations of a *normal* pronunciation; see S. da Silva Neto, *Introdução*, pp. 26-28.

[29] Underlying this colonial élite, of course, were several strata of society, each with its separate linguistic identity. We shall analyze the situation in greater detail in a later section of this study.

[30] S. da Silva Neto, Introdução, p. 73.

[31] The term mameluco (variant: mamaluco) is also used to denote the mixture of the European and the cariboca (variant: curiboca), the latter also of European and Indian blood.

[32] S. da Silva Neto transcribes a number of contemporary references to the early educational system in Brazil, drawn from the work of the Padre Nóbrega (Cartas Jesuíticas); Brandão (?) (Diálogo das Grandezas do Brazil), Frei Vicente de Salvador (História do Brasil), and others (see Introdução, pp. 74 ff.). The racial composition of Brazil in 1583 is given as: White, 25,000; Indian, 18,000; Negro, 14,000 (Introdução, p. 79).

[33] The importation of Negro slaves is estimated as 100,000 in the XVI Century, and 1,300,000 in the XVIII Century. In some quilombos (settlements of runaway slaves), of which the most famous was the República dos Palmares, the original African languages were briefly preserved. The Palmares settlement was chiefly composed of Angolan Negros (it was

also called Angola janga, or "Little Angola"); this settlement had an estimated population of 20,000 (including an Indian element), and was at length destroyed, after several unsuccessful efforts, by the bandeirantes paulistas Bernardo Vieira de Melo and Domingos Jorge Velho (in 1694).

[34] Numerous excerpts from travel accounts of the XIX Century are presented by Silva Neto, attesting to the near-universality of the Portuguese language in the interior (See Introdução, pp. 92 ff.).

[35] See Renato Mendonça, O português do Brasil, p. 110.

[36] See Sílvio Elia, Ensaios de filologia, pp. 87-88. Elia reproduces the analysis of Amoroso Lima with some slight modifications.

[37] "Os estudos de português no Brasil," a paper delivered at the Sixth International Colloquium of Luso-Brazilian Studies held at Harvard and Columbia Universities, Sept. 6 - 13, 1966. The paper is to be published in English translation in the Anais of the symposium.

[38] The generally conservative tendency of Colonial dialects is widely accepted, and specific studies exist for American Spanish, Canadian and Caribbean French, and others. The preservation of archaisms and a relatively high degree of

uniformity (homogeneity) in Colonial languages in general seems to be a psycho-linguistic or socio-linguistic phenomenon worthy of further attention. The characteristics of XVI-Century Portuguese, in summary, are: *Intonation*: Subjective comments indicate that the rhythm and intonation of the Portuguese of the first colonists in Brazil was more regular (in the sense of alternation of syllabic elements) and less rapid than in present peninsular speech. Fernão de Oliveira reports: "Nós falamos com grande repouso, como homens assentados." (apud Silva Neto, *História*, p. 482). *Pronunciation*: Final -*o* and -*e* were pronounced as [u] and [i]; pretonic *e* and *o* were preserved (i.e., *pedaço* = [pedásu], etc.). It appears that this pronunciation was maintained in "standard" Portuguese as late as the early XVIII Century, and consequently, that the elision of pretonic vowels, so characteristic of current Portuguese pronunciation, represents a very recent development. The sounds represented by *ç* and -*ss*- were distinct [ts] and [s], as were the -*ss* and -*s* [s] and [z]. Thus, *paço* [pátsu] was distinct from *passo* [pásu] and *cozer* [kodzér] from *coser* [kozér]. The dissolution of the ç/s distinction apparently manifested itself at an early date in the Southern Portuguese dialects, but did not become standard in the Central dialect until late in the XVI Century: S. da Silva

Neto cites a certain Pero Magalhães de Gândavo, who reports in his *Orthographia* (1574): "A mais da gente, e não só a vulgar, se engana na escritura, confundindo estas letras [*c*, *s*, *z*] e poendo umas por outras, sem distinção, sendo elas diferentes e distintas na pronunciação e natureza..." (*História*, p. 485). The affricate Northern Portuguese [ĉ] (=tch), written *ch*, persisted as a standard pronunciation in the XVI and XVII Centuries, and was eventually replaced by the Southern (š) adopted in Lisboa. The *x* - *ch* [š - ĉ] opposition was thus dissolved. The final and pre-consonantal -*s* and final -*z* did not develop the palatal or *chiado* pronunciation (š - ž), now standard in Portugal (Lisboa) and Brazil (Rio de Janeiro), until the early XVIII Century: the first reference to this evolution is date 1746 (see Silva Neto, *História*, p. 566). It is thus clear that the sibilant [s] represented by final -*s* and final -*z* in large areas of Brazil is a preservation of an earlier Peninsular norm. The characteristic Lisbonese [ai], which the Brazilian observers record as [ãi], represented by *e* plus or palatal (i.e., *e* + *ch*, *x*, *j*, *nh*) is primarily a phonetic phenomenon of the capital, and is of very recent date. It was thus absent from the Colonial *língua*-*padrão*, and probably, from the Imperial Court in Brazil. The references to the related pronunciation of *e* + *m* as [*ãi*], and *ei* as [*âi*] (i.e., *tem* =

[tãi]; beijo = [bâiju]) are chiefly from the late XIX Century (see Silva Neto, Introdução, pp. 175-177). The origin and evolution of the palatalization of -t, -d plus -e, -i in Brazil is unclear; M. de Paiva Boléo reports that the palatalized -t (e, i) is found in the Azores. He does not refer to the corresponding voiced variant, and gives no information on the chronological aspect of the phenomenon. This leaves to conjecture the possible influence of the introduction of a considerable Azorean element in Brazil in the XVIII Century (see M. de Paiva Boléo, Brasileirismos, pp. 28-30).

[39] The statements made here are couched in hypothetical form, since precise data are not available. The first awareness of the divergence of the Portuguese of Brazil is recorded at a much later date, certainly at a time when the differentiation process had been under way for years (if not centuries), and during a period when the history of the linguistic characteristics of Brazil had been complicated by the influence of the Tupi language, the various African dialects, and the presence of a significant non-Peninsular Portuguese component.

[40] Pigafeita (Pigafetti?) was one of the 18 members of the expedition who returned. His account was published in French

and Italian. The word *pindá* is found among the dozen or so indigenous words recorded by the chronicler. See Neiva, *Estudos da língua nacional*, p. 4.

[41] Padre Vieira, of course, also spent appreciable periods outside Brazil; only a little over half of his very long life (1608-1697) was spent in Brazil. In the XVII and XVIII Centuries, one might consider the works of the Padre Manuel Bernardes (1644-1710), Frei Luis de Souza, Francisco Manuel de Melo (1611-1666) and Frei António das Chagas; and for Brazil, Antônio José da Silva (1705-1726).

[42] The useful concept of the *linguagem transmitida* versus the *linguagem adquirida* is found in S. da Silva Neto, *Ensaios*, pp. 13 ff. We employ the term here in a different line of reasoning than Silva Neto. The development of this duality of language is recognized by many Brazilian observers: Gilberto Freyre in his *Casa grande e senzala* identifies a *língua dos senhores* versus a *língua dos nativos* in the early Colonial period, and a later *língua dos brancos* versus *língua dos negros* opposition, and states that this duality represents "... um vício, em nosso idioma, que só hoje, e através dos romancistas e poetas mais novos... vai sendo corrigido ou atenuado: o vácuo enorme entre a língua escrita e a língua falada" (*op. cit.*, pp. 176-177). Renato

Mendonça, who cites the Freyre statements above, would add another division, the *língua dos doutôres* and the *língua do povo*, and agrees that modern authors "... vão fixando a língua escrita do idioma brasileiro, com as concessões possíveis à língua falada" (Renato Mendonça. *O português do Brasil*, pp. 281-282). Even more pointed is this comment from Mário Marroquin's *A língua do Nordeste*, as cited by Mendonça: "É martírio para a mocidade que aprende e humilhação para o mestre que ensina, êsse bilinguismo dentro de um só idioma - essa unidade exterior, de superfície, de duas línguas que se repelem, a língua que falamos e a língua que escrevemos" (*A língua do Nordeste*, p. 170; apud Mendonça, *O português do Brasil*, pp. 129-130). We shall need to refer to this discontinuity of language level again in a later section of this study.

[43] Although the reference is applicable to a date falling within the next period (Phase III: *Imperial*), we may cite here the interesting work by José Jorge Paranhos da Silva: *O idioma do hodierno Portugal comparado com o do Brazil. Por um Brazileiro* (Rio, 1879). Paranhos da Silva dedicates the work as follows: "Aos moços que, se tendo ido formar em Coimbra, dizem que querem outra vez ser considerados como nascidos no Brazil, offereço esta comparação da nossa maneira

de falar com a dos actuaes Portuguezes" (*Op. cit.*, *Dedicatória*).

[44] I use the word tribes, since it is reported that non-Tupi speaking tribes of the *gentio* (savages) also adopted the *língua geral*. It is the name of José de Anchieta which is traditionally linked with the early missionary work with the Brazilian Indian, although it seems that a certain Padre Aspilcueta Navarro, who arrived with Padre Nóbrega in the first Jesuit expedition (1549), mastered the language to a higher degree than Anchieta, (third Jesuit expedition, 1553). Anchieta, however, is the author of the first Tupi grammar: *Arte da grammática da língua mais usada na costa do Brasil* (Leipzig, Teubner, 1876).

[45] Amadeu Amaral, in his *O dialecto Caipira*, states that the *língua geral* was in wider currency than Portuguese in the south of São Paulo during the entire XVIII Century, and that its use was forbidden by royal edict in 1727, "pela adulteração rápida que vinha realizando no idioma português." (*op. cit.*, p. 13). Lacking the sound represented in Portuguese by *f*, *l*, *r* (and thus, as an observer remarked, being "*sem fé, sem lei e sem rei*," the Tupi contribution to Brazilian Portuguese is chiefly in the lexical area (place names, flora, and fauna). An occasional separable affix

is seen in Portuguese - based words (brancarana, "whitish," from branco and -ana, Tupi for "appearing"); other Tupi suffixes are: -assu, ("big"), -mirim ("small"), -era (no longer existing), -tinga ("white;" cf. caatinga, "mato branco"), -úna ("black"), -pitanga ("red"), -oby ("green"), -iuba ("yellow"). The regional colloquialism "será?" used as an interrogative device (Chove, será?) may be due to Tupi influence (see Renato Mendonça, O português do Brasil, p. 165 ff.).

[46] The racial composition of the areas mentioned in 1583 is given by Padre Anchieta as follows: Bahia: Brancos, 12,000; Índios, 8,000; Negros, 2-4,000; for Pernambuco: Brancos, 8,000; Índios, 2,000; Negros, 10,000; for São Vicente: Brancos, 1,500; Índios 1,000; Negros, none; for Rio de Janeiro: Brancos, 750; Índios, 3.000; Negros, 100; for Espírito Santo: Brancos, 750; Índios, 4,500; Negros, none. The entire population of Brazil was 57,000, consisting of 25,000 Brancos, 18,000 Índios and 14,000 Negros. The Negro population grew apace: the estimated importation is 600,000 in the XVII Century and 1,300,000 in the XVIII Century. Padre Vieira gives us an interesting reaction to the problem of learning the língua travada of the Indians of the interior: "O primeiro trabalho é ouvi-la; o segundo

percebê-la; o terceiro reduzi-la a gramática e preceitos; e o quarto estudá-la; o quinto... pronunciá-la" (*Sermões V*, 337, apud Silva Neto, *Intro.*, p. 52). The language-learning problems of Padre Vieira were not over, for he later laments (in 1672), when he received orders to go to Italy: "Sei a *língua do Maranhão* e a portuguêsa, e é grande desgraça que ...haja nesta idade de estudar uma língua estrangeira." (Silva Neto, *op. cit.*, p. 61). There is a considerable variation in the population statistics cited for this period. Thales de Azevedo, without citing the source, refers to 40,000 *indígenas* settled in the Jesuit villages (*aldeias jesuíticas*) in Bahia shortly after 1553; a number which was reduced to 3,500 by 1583 (*Cultura e situação racial no Brasil*, p. 82); in another passage, Prof. Azevedo cites a total of 8,000 *índios domesticados* in the administrative limits of Bahia for 1583 (*op. cit.*, p. 78). Silva Neto, after citing the Anchieta census of 1583 to show the presence of 14,000 Negros in Brazil in 1583 (*Introdução*, p. 79), refers to the importation of 100,000 Negro slaves in the XVI Century (*op. cit.*, p. 80); and other discrepancies exist in the sources consulted.

[47] As opposed to the use of the word *crioulo* to refer to the Negro (or white - cf. Spanish *criollo*) born in the New

World. The term is employed in current Brazilian Portuguese, the writer believes, as a more acceptable term for a Negro than the word *prêto*: *prêtos*, it seems, prefer to refer to each other as *crioulos* (or, of course, *crioulas*).

[48] See Silva Neto, *Introdução*, pp. 141 ff.

[49] The best-known of these settlements was the *República dos Palmares*, established in the interior between Alagôas and Pernambuco early in the 17th century. Ruled by King Ganga-Zumba and later, by the "immortal" Zumbi, this settlement resisted numerous attacks by Dutch, and later, by Luso-Brazilian expeditions. Angola-Janga ("Little Angola"), as the settlement was called, numbered some 6,000 inhabitants at its peak, and was eventually destroyed by a force of *bandeirantes* under the command of Domingos Jorge Velho in 1694. See Edison Carneiro: *Ladinos e crioulos. Estudos sôbre o Negro no Brasil* (Rio, Editôra Civilização Brasileira, 1964), pp. 27 and *passim*.

[50] These comments were probably written in 1824 or 1825, for a book published in 1826 by Adrien Baldi: *Introduction à l'Atlas Ethnographique du Globe*. The Visconde says that the Portuguese of Brazil "se ressent de la douceur du climat et du caractère de ses habitants...et, tout en

conservant son énergie, elle a plus d'aménité"(*apud* Barbosa Lima Sobrinho, *A língua portuguesa*, p. 34).

[51] See Aita, *Il Portoghese*, p. 95; and Mendonça, *O português*, pp. 104-105. Varnhagem's comments appear in the *Florilégio de poesia brasileira* (Lisboa, 1850).

[52] Paranhos da Silva would allow his "primos" Eça de Queiroz and Camilo Castelo Branco to read his work, and recommends it to the attention of Teófilo Braga, "por uma razão contrária." He cites Teófilo as follows: "O Portuguez apresenta os seos dialectos importantíssimos, como o gallego, que estacionou... o indo-portuguez...o brazileiro, tanto o que falão os antigos colonos internados ou fazendeiros, como os da capital, que pratição insensivelmente a degeneração phonetica." (op.cit., *Dedicatória*; quoted from Teófilo Braga, *Historia da literatura Portuguesa*. Porto, 1875). In describing the elision of vowels in Peninsular Portuguese, Paranhos da Silva reports that "...os antigos, como attesta Rodrigues Lobo nos *Louvores da Lingoa Portugueza*, 'lião como escrevião e assim falavão.' Hoje, porem (permittão a expressão) os Portuguezes escrevem *farinha* e leem *feijão*." (op. cit., p. 57, note 19). Paranhos also cites the Peninsular pronunciation of *bejo* (for *beijo*) as "bâijo"

[which can only rhyme with *queijo* ("quâijo")]; the sibilant *s* of Brazil, as compared to the *s chiante* of Portugal; the Brazilian loss of distinction in first person plural preterites (-ámos lost in Brazil); the -*em* as -*ãi* ("como se vê em *tem*, que poetas portuguezes rimão com *mãi*"[p. 27]), pointing out that the Brazilian cannot use his pronunciation of Belém to refer to the city near Lisboa, which is pronounced "Blãi;" the Brazilian reduction of -*ai*- plus -*x*- to -*a*- (in *caixa*, *baixo*); and, after listing some Peninsular gallicisms unknown to Brazil, he gives a list of words differing in meaning in Brazil and Portugal, as well as a list of indigenous Brazilian terms and combining forms (*mirim*, *guassú*, *peva* ["baixo e largo"], *tapera*, *caipora*, etc.). In the area of syntax, Paranhos cites the Peninsular use of the dative (*lhe*) as a substitute for the possessives *meu*, *teu* ("que nós substituimos ás vezes por *delle*" [Part II, p. 15]); with respect to the position of the pronouns *me*, *te*, *se*, he states: "Estes pronomes são hoje no idioma falado em Portugal constantemente collocados depois dos verbos; emquanto que no Brazil, como acontecia no antigo Portugal, collocão-se ás vezes depois, mas quasi sempre antes delles." (Part II, p. 20); *estar calor* as equivalent to Brazilian *estar fazendo calor*; in commands, "...apezar do que dizem os grammaticos de Portugal, podemos dizer: *Vossê me perdôe*, *me diga*, *me dê*, como felizmente se ouve no Brazil" (Part II, p. 22, note 7); and for the first time, Paranhos finds a different nuance in the Brazilian pronoun placement in commands: "...as nossas locuções *me perdôe*, *me dê*... são muito mais delicados, e mesmo razoaveis, do que aquellas em que se manda perdoar em que se pede *mandando dar*, *me dá* tem quasi o tom de pergunta; si porem, não é pergunta, corresponde a *vous allez me donner* do povo mais delicado do mundo." (Part II, p. 22, note 7). Paranhos cites Herculano to support alleged Brazilian faulty usage of personal infinitive with expressed subject (p. 27), and finds Brazilian use of *em* with verbs of motion in Eça de Queiroz. The Brazilian usage of the subject pronoun as object is referred to: "Si dizemos *para eu fazer*, *para tu andares*...porque não poderemos dizer como se ouve ás vezes no Brazil, *ouvir elle propôr*, e teremos só licença de empregar a locução *ouvir-lhe propôr*? Não vejo razão." (Part II, pp. 32-33). It may be justifiable to transcribe an anecdote recorded by Paranhos da Silva in discussing the use of *êle* for *o*: "Tenho diante de mim um exemplar dos contos do Conego Schmid traduzidos pelo Dr. Nuno Alvares, exemplar que servio n'uma escola regida por um Portuguez. Na pg. 2 lê-se: 'Não o creio porque nunca vi *elle* fazer um unico movimento.' O Portuguez, o mestre dos desventurados mininos, riscou a palavra *elle*, e escreveo por cima *o* (podia até pôr *lhe*, pois o verbo *vêr* não pode ser perante a grammatica diverso de *ouvir*); e a coisa ficou assim: 'Não *o* creio porque nunca *o* vi fazer um unico movimento.' Cada um dos dous *oo* refere-se a cousa diversa, e torna isto digno só da *s'benta** do Primo." (*assim chamão elles [os portuguêses] a *guardeneta de aula*). Cf. op. cit., p. 33, note 19.

[53] To a considerable degree, Goncalves Dias rejects the customary reverence of the "classics": "Chamem-se embora classicos, muitos delles -- são intoleraveis. Eu de mim o confesso que os leio, a boa somma delles, como por castigo...." Portuguese needs further enrichment, according to the poet, in order to be able to accompany and interpret the modern world: "Em primeiro logar a nossa lingua é riquissima, mas até sua idade de ouro; mas dahi por diante não acompanhou os progressos do século." (apud E. Sanches, *A língua brasileira*, p. 15).

[54] "Mas os nossos rapazes estão noutro caso. Se não fazem do portuguez o seu estudo unico e quasi que

exclusivo - tambem não se contentam, os bons, que temos, com a frandulagem de máos romances francezes. Lêm mais do que isso: estudam as litteraturas ingleza e allemã - e da hespanhola e italiana encontra-se mais de dez no Brasil por um que em Portugal se applica a taes litteraturas." (E. Sanches, op. cit., pp. 15-16).

[55] "E que emfim o que é brasileiro é brasileiro, e que *cuya* virá a ser tão clássico, como *porcelana*, ainda que a não achem tão bonita." (E. Sanches, op. cit., p. 17). The comments quoted are from the year 1857.

[56] This is surprising in the case of a poet, presumably especially sensitive to oral forms. Since Gonçalves Dias first went to Portugal at the age of 14 (in 1838), and completed both the secondary and University courses in Coimbra, there was no lack of opportunity to observe Peninsular language patterns. He does refer to the inadmissibility of rhymes such as *mãe* with *também* ("... não há brasileiro, nem mesmo surdo, que tolere a rima de *mãe* com *também*, como aqui fazem os bons rimadores, ou que admitisse um *tambãim* impossível, como a gente culta de Lisboa." [apud E. Sanches, *A língua brasileira*, p. 19]. Gonçalves Dias' interest in the Tupi or *língua geral* is seen in his *Dicionário da Língua Tupi*, published in 1858.

[57] Pinheiro Chagas recorded his criticism in the Novos ensaios críticos (Pôrto, 1867), inveighing against "...a mania de tornar o brasileiro uma língua differente do velho portuguez por meio de neologismos arrojados e injustificaveis e de insubordinações grammaticaes...." (cf. E. Sanches, A língua brasileira, pp. 22-23; and Elia, Ensaios, pp. 160-161). The specific faults identified in Alencar were the reduced use of the definite articles, omission of se with reflexive verbs, irregularities in the placement of object pronouns, and the presence of a few gallicisms (Elia, Ensaios, p. 161). Alencar replied to Chagas in the pos-escrito of the second edition of Iracema (1870), rejecting the thesis that the laws of linguistic change are inflexible and not subject to alteration by the individual, and emphasizing that "...a transformação profunda do idioma de Portugal existe no Brasil, é fato incontestável." (apud Elia, Ensaios, 161).

[58] Feliciano de Castilho and Joaquim Nabuco entered the anti-Alencar lists; the Peninsular Camilo Castelo Branco came off second best in his dispute with the Brazilian Carlos de Laet. See Elia, Ensaios, 157 ff.; E. Sanches, A língua brasileira, passim; Silva Neto, Introdução, 241 ff. As the positions of the Brazilian

and Portuguese, or the classicist and vernaculist, adherents became more definite, the polemics increased in number and intensity. From 1902-1905, Rui Barbosa and Carneiro Ribeiro generated many thousands of pages in their monumental dispute; Cândido de Figueiredo feuded with Mário Barreto, Heráclito Graça, and Paulino de Brito (1902-1903); Xavier Fernandes opposed the views of Jorge Daupiás, Carlos Góis and João Ribeiro (1912); Leite de Vasconcellos also criticized the position of João Ribeiro (1912); Agostinho de Campos attacked the statements of both João Ribeiro and Cândido Jucá (1924). (See *Anais*...*de língua vernácula*, p. 218 ff.).

59 The first recorded *brasileirismo*, according to Artur Neiva, appeared in the 1549 *epístola* of Manoel de Nóbrega: The term *moqueados* (dried or grilled meat); *pindá* (fishhook) is recorded by Pigafetti, chronicler of the expedition of Fernão de Magalhães (whose account, however, was not published in Portuguese). The compilations were initiated by Antônio Pereira Coruja with his *Coleção de Vocábulos e Frases usados na Província de S. Pedro do Rio Grande do Sul* (London, 1852), followed by the *Vocabulário brasileiro para servir de complemento aos dicionários da língua portuguêsa* (1853) by Brás da da Costa Rubim. In 1887, Guilherme de Alcântara Bellegarde

published his *Vocábulos e locuções da língua portuguêsa*; in 1888, the letters A-C of the *Dicionário brasileiro da língua portuguêsa*, by Antônio Joaquim de Macedo Soares [this work was later published in its entirety by Macedo Soares' son (2 vols. Rio de Janeiro, Ministério da Educação e Cultura, 1954-1955)]; in 1889, the Visconde de Beaurepaire Rohan edited his *Dicionário de vocábulos brasileiros*; and in a later period, Rodolpho Garcia: *Diccionário de brasileirismos* (1915); Raul Pederneiras: *Geringonça carioca - Verbetes para um diccionário de gyria* (1922), etc. A compilation combining the data in these and other similar studies, and providing bibliographical data, is Manuel Viotti: *Nôvo dicionário da gíria brasileira* (3.ª Ed. Rio de Janeiro, Tupã Editôra, 1957. 476 pp.). Sílvio Elia also synthesizes several such regional listings in his "A unidade lingüística do território brasileiro" (*Anais de língua vernácula*, pp. 15-47 and 216-244). And see Edgard Sanches, *A língua*, pp. 129-149 for further details on early lists of regionalisms.

60 These works range from the early Indianist novels of Joaquim Manuel de Macedo (1820-1882), José de Alencar (1829-1877), and Alfredo d'Escragnolle Taunay (1843-1899), to the regional novels of Euclides da Cunha (1866-1909),

Afonso Arinos (1868-1916), Coelho Neto (1864-1934), Afrânio Peixoto (1876-1947) and Graça Aranha (1868-1931). The thread of Brasilianism was picked up again somewhat later in the works of Mário de Andrade (1893-1945), Osvald de Andrade (1890-1953), José Américo de Almeida (1887- ), Rachel de Queiroz (1910- ), José Lins de Rêgo (1901-1957), Jorge de Lima (1895-1953), Graciliano Ramos (1892-1953), Amando Fontes (1899-1867), Jorge Amado (1912- ), João Guimarães Rosa (1908-1968), and others. See Mendonça, *O português*, pp. 282-306.

61 During the most impassioned phase of the debate, the attentions of virtually the entire academic community seem to have been directed to the issues involved. As Artur Neiva puts it "...assim como em França tudo acaba em canção, no Brasil tudo acabam em gramática. Recordações talvez dos sofrimentos que me eram infligidos pelos saudosos professores da meninice, quando me obrigavam a papaguear regras gramaticais que felizmente esqueci para todo o sempre." (A. Neiva, *Estudos*, p. xxiv). The "language" versus "dialect" matter is treated in M. de Paiva Boléo, *Brasileirismos*, passim; Agostinho de Campos, *Futuro*, 47 ff.; Ciro Pádua, *O dialeto*, passim; Xavier Marques, *Cultura*, pp. 88-89; Renato Mendonça, *O português*, pp. 199 ff.; Júlio Ribeiro, *História*, pp. 108 ff. From

the study of the immense literature on pronoun placement, several interesting conclusions may be drawn. First, Peninsular linguists became aware of a difference, a strangeness in the patterns of Brazilian Portuguese. This was at first attributed to an imperfect control of language by uneducated colonial speakers. "A língua portugueza lidima tem quindins, que escapam facilmente a quem se habituou ao falar do Brasil, que é portuguez muito simplificado e reduzido á expressão mais simples." This according to Agostinho de Campos, criticizing the Brazilian Cândido Jucá (apud João Leda, A chimera, p. 16). In the search for the linguistic details which created the effect of non-conformity, a few examples of irregular pronoun placement were noted and identified as "errors." In the light of citations adduced by Brazilians showing that such placement was in fact unassailably classic, and pointing out similar usages in Peninsular writers (which had gone unchallenged and unnoticed), the grammarians for the first time attempted to codify correct pronoun usage. The net result of the effort seems to indicate that pronoun placement is regulated by considerations of euphony and clarity. Since these are highly subjective, not mechanical aspects of language, no definite codification is possible. It would seem that in this, as well as in other linguistic areas (phonology, lexicon), Brazilian speakers and writers elected to favor different linguistic options available in the language. This process of selective differentiation is primarily responsible for the different _feição_ or _jeito_ offered by Brazilian Portuguese, even though it remains clearly the _língua portuguêsa_.

62 "Muitos dos nossos brasileirismos, e muita da nossa gramática, não passam de arcaísmos preservados na América." (João Ribeiro, apud Joaquim Ribeiro, _História_, p. 35). See also Amadeu Amaral, _O dialeto_, p. 28; Renato Mendonça, _O português_, pp. 120 ff.; Sílvio Elia, "A unidade..." (in _Anais...de língua vernácula_, pp. 16-47). It is clear, of course, that a great many lexical items were drawn from Tupi-Guarani and incorporated into Brazilian Portuguese, although estimates of the total number vary widely. A number of Africanisms presumed to be of Brazilian origin may have arrived in Brazil via Portugal. See João Leda, _A chimera_, pp. 34 ff. and A. Tenório d'Albuquerque, "O português..." pp. 140 ff.

63 The levels of oral Brazilian Portuguese useful for purposes of discussion and analysis might be: a) the _linguagem familiar_: the normal speech patterns of the

educated class in informal or semi-formal circumstances (i.e., not restricted to use within a family group, but applicable in general social contacts); b) linguagem popular: the speech patterns of the minimally educated or illiterate class, especially of the urban milieu, containing usages generally regarded as sub-standard, and undisciplined by intensive contact with or use of the written language; c) gíria: the corpus of neologisms and special semantic transfers (standard words used with non-standard meanings), generally applicable to a limited area or segment of society. Elements from this level regularly invade the other strata, even literary prose; and d) falares regionais: equivalent to regional dialects. Characterized chiefly by the presence of non-Portuguese elements which have not found general acceptance, and by Portuguese archaisms no longer in general use. The interrelationship of these speech levels and the formal literary language is a striking linguistic phenomenon of present-day Brazil. The observer cannot fail to be impressed by the high degree of interpenetration and fusion of language levels in the contemporary period. Antenor Nascentes is one of the few Brazilian linguists who has presented a clear and forthright discussion of this phenomenon (principally in his O linguajar carioca).

64 By the broadest definition, the Modernist movement extends from 1900 to the present date, with 1900-1920 identified as *Pre-Modernista*, 1920-1930 as *Modernismo*, and 1945 to the present as *Neo-Modernismo* (See S. Elia, *Ensaios*, 87 ff.; and Alceu Amoroso Lima, *Quadro sintético da literatura brasileira*. 2.ª Ed. (Rio de Janeiro, Agir, 1959. 161 pp.), and Afrânio Coutinho, *Introdução à literatura no Brasil*. 4.ª Ed. (Rio de Janeiro, Livraria São José, 1968. 392 pp.). The two chief catalytic events related to the movement were the *Semana de Arte Moderna* (São Paulo, 1922) and Graça-Aranha and his "discurso-bomba" at the Academia Brasileira de Letras (Rio 1924), proclaiming: "Não somos a câmara mortuária de Portugal!" (Lessa, *O Modernismo*, p. 18). The initial driving force of the movement, chiefly poetic, came from the Rio-São Paulo-Minas Gerais area with Mário de Andrade, Osvald de Andrade, Manuel Bandeira, Ronald de Carvalho, Renato Almeida and Raúl Bopp. The second generation adds prose writers and the Northeast, with José Lins do Rêgo, Raquel de Queiroz, Graciliano Ramos, Jorge Amado, José de Lima, Vinicius de Morais and Augusto F. Schmidt. And few indeed are the current writers and poets who are not comfortable, for the most part unconscious of the fact, within the philosophy of Modernism. Since the initial objectives of

the movement were to shock, stimulate and destroy both the artificial purism of the gramatiqueiros and the notion of the exclusivism of urban culture, the first literary products were exaggerated distortions of Brazilian style. Both metrical and linguistic independence was declared by Manuel Bandeira:

"Estou farto do lirismo que pára e vai averiguar no
dicionário o cunho vernáculo de um vocábulo
Abaixo os puristas...."

and especially the much-quoted:

"A vida não me chegava pelos jornais nem pelos livros
Vinha da bôca do povo na língua errada do povo
Língua certa do povo
Porque êle é que fala gostoso o português do Brasil
Ao passo que nós
O que fazemos
É macaquear
A sintaxe lusíada." (In Libertinagem [1930], from "Evocação do Recife"). Mário de Andrade makes it quite clear that he deliberately distorted his prose for shock effect. In a letter to Manuel Bandeira of 1925, Mário writes: "...é que eu por enquanto tenho os exageros e os defeitos naturais nas revoluções e começos." And in the same letter: "...eu empobreci os meus meios de

expressão. Não faço dúvida nisso. Empobreci-os conscientemente.... Não compreendo revoluções com luvas de pelica." (From Luiz Carlos Lessa, O Modernismo, p. 24).

65 Luiz Carlos Lessa, in his excellent study O modernismo brasileiro e a língua portuguêsa (Rio, 1966), comments: "Com efeito, não temos dúvida em afiançar que se Pinheiro Chagas ou José Feliciano de Castilho se escandalizaram com os 'erros' (quase sempre) e erros (poucas vêzes) que depararam na prosa alencariana, então hoje, se vivos fôssem, por certo se suicidariam, após a leitura das obras da maioria de nossos modernistas." (op.cit., p. 15). It is true that the official manuals of Portuguese for the schools have not accepted the linguistic emancipation proclaimed by the modernists and fully established in the contemporary literary language. Thus, at least until departure from the ginásio, the Brazilian is still plagued by a language dichotomy, not only the formal versus colloquial styles (a disparity here may always exist), but also between literary usage as prescribed in the school, and literary usage as exemplified by the best contemporary authors. As noted above, only a very few grammarians have espoused the syntactical flexibility observable in Brazilian Portuguese. Notable among these is Antenor Nascentes (cf. his O linguajar carioca, passim).

66 J. Mattoso Câmara was responsible for the introduction of the general theory of modern Linguistics into Brazil, with his Princípios de lingüística geral (1941), his specialized study of the Brazilian phoneme (Rio de Janeiro, 1949), and many other monographic studies. The author of this study is personally indebted to Professor J. Mattoso Câmara for orientation in this section. The history of linguistic studies presented is, of course, quite incomplete. It should be mentioned that the second course in Linguistics was offered at the University of Paraná in 1960; and that Professor Aryon dall' Igna Rodrigues carried this program with him to Brasília in 1962; and that the "Setor lingüístico" of the Museu Nacional in Rio functioned importantly in Linguistics under Professor Mattoso Câmara, and later, under Professor Rodrigues. The role of the Yázigi Language Institute, and especially of its Linguistics Center, should also be mentioned. Professor Francisco Gomes de Matos, the youthful director of this Center, together with J. Mattoso Câmara and Aryon Rodrigues, are the key figures in current programs in Brazil. These programs have recently received significant and deserved support from the Ford Foundation, with Professor Bryan Head (of the University of Texas and Coimbra) as official consultant.

67 See Aryon Rodrigues, "Relatório," passim.